

From: Stephen Rozov
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner
Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 8 35 AM
Subject: Modification of Ownership Rules

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioners

Having worked in the broadcast industry for over 20 years, may I express my deep concern regarding any further alterations in the media ownership rules. Since the passage of the Telecommunications Act in 1996, a disastrous, in my opinion, consolidation of media outlets has taken place to the detriment of diverse opinions in the marketplace. Of most concern is the aggressive acquisition of broadcast and print properties by individuals with a clear political agenda. The current situation endangers our freedom of speech. Any further weakening of the ownership rules would further that situation. These airways are owned by the public and regulated by the FCC in the public interest. Do the job for which you were appointed. Regulate!

Sincerely,

Steve Rozov
1216 Mason Avenue
Drexel Hill, PA 19026

From: Michael Halperin
To: Commissioner Adelstein
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 8 35 AM
Subject: Re Comments to the Commissioner

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 2003

Dear Mr. Adelstein

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Thank you for forwarding your "Citizen Kane" remarks to my attention

Last night Bill Moyers interviewed Michael Copps and he reiterated the same themes you brought up. The surprise to me is that Sen. Boxer has been able to line up only 15 senators to oppose this speedy decision. It's imperative that public hearings be held in all parts of the nation and not only in the marbled halls of government. If there is anything I can do to assist your effort, please feel free to contact me at any time.

Michael Halperin

Commissioner Adelstein wrote

- > Thank you. I share much of your concern. Spoke about it last week in SF (see
- > speech at this site) * JA
- >
- > <http://www.fcc.gov/commissioners/adelstein/speeches2003.html>
- >
- > >>> Dr. Michael Halperin 05/01/03 05:37PM >>>
- > Dr. Michael Halperin (michaelhalperin@sprintmail.com) writes
- >
- > As a professor of mass communication and a professional who works in
- > television, I believe I have a unique perspective on the rush by the FCC to
- > eliminate limits to broadcast ownership. Its actions hark back to an earlier
- > era when radio first became a mass medium.
- >
- > After World War I the U.S. Navy took total control of the medium. Congress in its
- > wisdom would not permit government control over the public's airwaves. In a
- > sly move, the Navy and General Electric formed RCA in order to control all
- > radio patents. Today we see a similar move in the consolidation of all
- > broadcasting under a few, very large umbrellas.
- >
- > The Radio Act of 1927 specifically forbade licenses to monopolies and required
- > stations to operate for the "public interest, convenience, or The
- > Communication Act of 1934 that formed the FCC required that broadcasters
- > promote "public convenience or interest or serve public
- >
- > Over the years we have seen the rights of the people slowly erode as each
- > critical tenet of legislation has crumbled under the weight of convergence
- > brought about by more and more radio and television stations owned by fewer
- > and fewer corporate entities. Diversity of viewpoint that promotes the public
- > good will only happen if we maintain the current rules -- although I believe
- > we should return to the 12 station rule established in 1985.
- >
- > The Telecom Act of 1996 provides too much leeway as it is. Although it places
- > limits on one owner or one company to 35% of the audience, UHF counts only as
- > a percentage thus CBS has 48% although under the percentage rules, the FCC
- > counts it as 40% - still higher than allowed. This represents a cruel joke on
- > the American public. They are the proprietors of the air, not corporations.

> They are the stewards of broadcasting, not conglomerates. The people represent
> many viewpoints and that diversity must be maintained by insuring that
> broadcasters live up to the mandate established by Congress over 75 years ago
> to insure that license renewals be based on the ability of broadcasters to
> promote the "public convenience or interest or serve public necessity."

>
> In the interest of diversity and the promotion of creativity, the rules should
> not be changed. Five companies should not control the preponderance of
> broadcasting. That is not democracy, that is oligopoly.

> Sincerely,

>
> Michael Halperin, Ph.D.
> Lecturer, School of Film & Television
> Loyola Marymount University
> Los Angeles, California

> -----

> Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
> Remote host: 68.165.183.138
> Remote IP address: 68.165.183.138

> -----

> Name: TEXT/html
> TEXT/html Type: Hypertext Markup Language (text/html)
> Encoding: base64
> Description: TEXT/html

RECEIVED

MAY - 8 2003

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

From: Kashia2@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:35 AM
Subject: (no subject)

DEAR CHAIRMAN PLEASE, LET THE PEOPLE OF AMERICA HEAR MORE, DISCUSS MORE, AND KNOW MORE ABOUT YOUR DECISION TO HARM OUR GREAT, DEMOCRATIC, COUNTRY, BY ALLOWING ONLY A FEW BIG COMPANIES, TO HAVE THE USE OF OUR AIR WAVES, THE AIRWAVES THAT BELONG TO ALL OF US THANK YOU SO MUCH

Aliza

From: Peter B Collins/home office
To: Mike Powell, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy, KM KJMWEB, Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 51 AM
Subject: Delay deregulation!

Commissioners,

I appreciate the efforts of Mr Copps and Mr Adelstein to gather public comments on the expected June 2 deregulation measures

All of the comments I heard--Columbia, San Francisco, USC--indicate that irreparable damage to the public interest will occur if you further relax the ownership limits and crossownership rules

I respectfully request that you do your duty, and value the public interest in diversity of voices--not just outlets--over the business interests of the media conglomerates. You must study these issues further, and delay the action the Chairman proposes for June 2.

Thank you for your consideration

Peter B Collins
San Anselmo, California

From: Kathy Yockey
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 7:47 AM
Subject: Changes is the rules

Dear Mr. Powell,

I have been aware for some time about the changes you are trying to make in media ownership. I have already turned the television news off because I don't feel like I am getting fair and balanced reporting. I am sure this email will make no difference but I have also heard that the internet could be regulated. The internet is the only place I can get fair and balanced news reporting now. My vote is no on the changes you are attempting to make!

Kathy Yockey

From: Louredhk@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:39 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Mr. Powell

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Thank you,
Louis Molinari
Red Hook, NY 12571-1207

From: A Young
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 10:27 AM
Subject: Free Speech Rights

To: Honorable Michael K. Powell

Dear Chairman

I urge you to not relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect me and all the other American citizens from media monopolies. A free press protects us all and a monopolized press is not free.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total or total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. Many of the corporations now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a well known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. In particular, many of these conglomerates have tried in the past to keep our common viewpoints off the air or edited by an editorial staff with political limitations. The local communities across the country should decide which viewpoints to allow on the air by simply switching the channel and promoting those advertisers who support the media outlet they support.

The American people deserve to hear more than one or two points of view on not just important issues, but any issue. Therefore, for the sake of our democratic republic and our many freedoms, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections, that for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country and consequently have helped ensure a healthy country.

Sincerely,

Andrew F. Young

Andrew F. Young, Esq. Intellectual Property Law
115 Orchid St., Floral Park, NY 11001
Phone/Fax: 516-775-0068, Cellular: 516-770-2248

Important Notice: This communication is privileged and confidential and is intended solely for the recipient or their agent.

Should this communication be received in error, please retain in confidence and contact the above for immediate retrieval.

From: BEVKAISER@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:25 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Chairman Powell,

I am writing to oppose the proposed ruling which would allow the media to be controlled by only about five large companies. The air waves belong to the people and the people have a right to hear the views of many different news organizations and commentators. No one company should be allowed to own 35% of all television outlets. People cannot make informed decisions in elections or other aspects of their lives if they are not allowed to hear all the facts. This ruling would mean that the United States is well on its way to becoming like Iraq before the war, or China, where dissenting views are not allowed.

Beverly Kaiser (BEVKAISER@aol.com)
80 Country Club Drive
Beach Plum 3
South Yarmouth, MA 02664

From: jhsieser@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 6:49 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Please do not ease the broadcast ownership regulations that protect the American citizens from media monopolies. Americans do not want the media to control television and radio news with their particular slanted bias, keeping opposing views off the air.

Thank you,
Jerry Sieser

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Drcleanswep@aol.com
To: Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, jadelste@fc.gov
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:10 PM
Subject: rules and law change

Dear Sirs and Madam

We are writing to ask you NOT to relax the broadcast ownership rules that prevent media monopolies

If the proposed broadcast ownership rules are adopted, independent voices in cities across the United States of America could be snuffed out by huge media corporations. This is already happening in my city.

There could be even whole states and regions in which one media company could decide which viewpoints to allow on the air in their area and could silence those which they do not want to hear.

The big media companies have in the past used their power to keep opposing viewpoints off the air. These proposed rule changes would give them far greater power to keep opposing views off the air and out of the newspapers.

Many of the corporations that are fighting for these rule changes, including media giants Viacom/CBS and Disney/ABC, are precisely the same companies that have tried in the past to keep my viewpoints off the air.

I hope that these proposed rule changes would not be put in effect as to infringe upon the right of Free Speech by the American People.

Thank you for your confederation

Donald Self

From: Arthur735@cs.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 9:45 PM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Mr. Powell

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies.

These proposed changes would pave the way for giant media conglomerates to gain near-total control of radio and television news and information in communities across our nation. And many of the corporations that are now lobbying the FCC to relax these ownership rules already have a known track record in attempting to keep opposing viewpoints off the air.

The American people deserve to hear more than one point of view on important issues. Therefore, for the sake of our democracy and our freedom, I urge you to continue the broadcast ownership protections that, for decades, have helped to ensure a healthy political debate in our country.

Sincerely
A. Romano

From: Leaderful Teams Consulting and Bluff House Retreats
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:33 AM
Subject: Stop increased corporate ownership of the public airwaves

Dear Mr. Copps,

Thank you for reaching out to the public to raise awareness about the corporate monopoly of the public airwaves.

We were shocked recently when we learned that the restrictions on regional multi-media ownership had been dissolved.

We agree with Rep. Jay Inslee that it is "imperative to democracy to have equal access to all points of the agenda", and we think that the media in general is already too influenced by its corporate owners. The preservation of our democracy depends on a diversity of ownership, views, and information.

As one man quoted at today's hearing in Seattle pointed out, "Fewer owners means fewer chances to have our voices heard."

Thank you for this opportunity to respond.

Sincerely,

Julie Glover
Robert Kenny
7292 Maxwellton Road
Clinton, WA 98236

CC: Politics: George Bush, Politics: Dick Cheney, Patty Murray Politics, Maria Cantwell Politics, Politics: Rick Larsen 2d Dist

From: Meredith B Mills
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:38 AM
Subject: deregulation of telecommunications media

Watching Bill Moyers Now I learned that the FCC is about to deregulate the ownership of American media -- eliminating the safeguards (i.e. that no one company/organization can own more than 35% of telecommunications media). I urge you NOT to do this -- profit driven media control, which would surely ensue, is not in the best interests of Democracy!

Thank you for considering my opinion,

Sincerely,
Meredith Mills
Beaverton, OR

From: Meredith B Mills
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:39 AM
Subject: telecommunications deregulation

Watching Bill Moyers Now I learned that the FCC is about to deregulate the ownership of American media -- eliminating the safeguards (i.e. that no one company/organization can own more than 35% of telecommunications media). I urge you NOT to do this -- profit driven media, which would surely ensue, is not in the best interests of Democracy!

Thank you for considering my opinion,

Sincerely,
Meredith Mills
Beaverton, OR

From: Joe Freiburger
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:40 AM
Subject: Don't let the media companies have more market share

Please stop allowing the media to take over more and more market share. Go the other way - one owner, one station, one network. If we can't hear the issues, we can't make informed decisions. We may be able to go to the polls, but we don't know what we are voting about. Clear Channel owns 54% of the radio market in the USA - that's one voice to over half the people.

Thank you,
Joe Freiburger
7321 Howdershell Rd
Hazelwood, MO 63042

From: Joe Freiburger
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:40 AM
Subject: No more market share

Please stop allowing the media to take over more and more market share. Go the other way - one owner, one station, one network. If we can't hear the issues, we can't make informed decisions. We may be able to go to the polls, but we don't know what we are voting about. Clear Channel owns 54% of the radio market in the USA - that's one voice to over half the people.

Thank you,
Joe Freiburger
7321 Howdershell Rd
Hazelwood, MO 63042

From: nancy loeb
To: Mike Powell, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein, Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:52 AM
Subject: media ownership

As a citizen I am strongly apposed to further media ownership consolidation. We already have moved too far in that direction and the information available to citizens in our effort to be informed, is compromised. Where did the concept of "healthy competition" get lost? I am old enough to see the repeated cycle of the power shift. I hope the commission recognizes the overriding danger of too wide a swing to corporate power.

Sincerely

N A Loeb

Do you Yahoo!?
The New Yahoo! Search - Faster Easier Bingo
<http://search.yahoo.com>

From: Richard Bohn
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:53 AM
Subject: history and responsibility

Dear Kathleen,

Please give the American people the opportunity to understand what is at stake in giving up the air waves into corporate hands. Give us time to debate and truly hear the opinions of all. Do not be in such a hurry. You are in a position as gatekeeper now. Taking more power out of the hands of individual Americans and giving it to corporate interests is not in the interest of Democracy. It is in the interest of money and power.

Don't let your name be associated with a bad decision. Help American freedom of speech endure.

Please vote with your heart,

Richard Bohn
Spokane, WA

From: LISA MARTIN
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12:56 AM
Subject: June 2 meeting

Dear Madam,

I am writing to express my very grave concern over the upcoming June 2 meeting to discuss the sale of our nation's airwaves. As a concerned citizen, history teacher and consumer of media, I demand, on behalf of the American people that this process be opened up so that the American people can be informed of the very serious nature of these decisions and how it will impact our fourth pillar of democracy: press freedom.

I have lived outside the US for over 12 years, and have only recently moved back to the US this past summer. I have seen and lived through this media grab in other countries, and the implications for press diversity is truly frightening. I urge you to communicate with the American people and to educate them quickly as to what is at stake. **THIS IS YOUR DUTY AND YOUR JOB.**

I trust the FCC will make decisions on behalf of the American people.

Lisa Martin
43641 Calabro St
Temecula CA 92592

From: katie romero
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 12 57 AM
Subject: Deregulation

May 2, 2003

To whom It May Concern,(and it concerns all of us in this country)

I find it extremely disturbing to think that control of the media, internet, and airwaves could potentially be owned by a handfull of greedy corporations. It is imperative in a democracy that independent voices be heard. Please vote accordingly and prevent these monopolies from taking control of the minds of our people and using them for their own purposes.

Kathryn Romero
Redondo Beach, CA

Protect your PC - get McAfee.com VirusScan Online
<http://clinic.mcafee.com/clinic/ibuy/campaign.asp?cid=3963>

From: heifetz
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 02 AM
Subject: Consolidation of media

Commissioner

Strongly suggest that the vote on whether a media company can control most of the airways in an area be delayed until hearings are held throughout the land. The public should learn the pros and cons of the proposed change enabling media consolidation. FCC action should only be implemented after they have heard from the informed public.

Dr. S. B. Heifetz

From: LAURATIMTHOMAS@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:03 AM
Subject: (no subject)

Dear Commissioner,

I am writing this short letter to ask that you delay your vote for the upcoming June meeting regarding the expanding of market share of large media conglomerates. It is dangerous to approach such a momentous decision without a thorough discussion and analysis. My concern is that this upcoming vote will be perceived as a special-interest motivated process. I don't know if there is truth to this assumption. But I am greatly concerned that voting to expand the market share of the media conglomerates will reduce the diversity of journalistic reporting on important issues of the day. To decide vote in June on such a potential water-shed event which can profoundly effect our American culture is too rushed. There should be more public comment and discussion. Thus, I am writing that there be a delay in this June vote until more public awareness of it is given.

Sincerely,

Tim Thomas

2940 Freeborn St

Duarte, CA 91010

From: albert de luna
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 05 AM
Subject: broadcast ownership rules -do not relax them

I urge you not to relax the broadcast ownership rules that protect American citizens from media monopolies. The American people deserve to hear from more than one point of view on important issues. For the sake of democracy and freedom, do not change the rules.
Respectfully
Albert De Luna Parsippany, NJ 07054

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: LAURATIMTHOMAS@aol.com
To: Michael Copps
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:06 AM
Subject: Please delay the June FCC vote on whether to expand the market-share of media

Dear Commissioner Copps,

I am writing this short letter to ask that you delay your vote for the upcoming June meeting regarding the expanding of market share of large media conglomerates. It is dangerous to approach such a momentous decision without a thorough discussion and analysis. My concern is that this upcoming vote will be perceived as a special-interest motivated process. I don't know if there is truth to this assumption. But I am greatly concerned that voting to expand the market share of the media conglomerates will reduce the diversity of journalistic reporting on important issues of the day. To decide vote in June on such a potential water-shed event which can profoundly effect our American culture is too rushed. There should be more public comment and discussion. Thus, I am writing that there be a delay in this June vote until more public awareness of it is given.

Sincerely,

Tim Thomas

2940 Freeborn St

Duarte, CA 91010

From: Linda
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 07 AM
Subject: media ownership rules

I am very disheartened to learn that the FCC is seriously contemplating changing media ownership rules to permit increased ownership of media outlets by a single individual or organization. It's puzzling that an issue of this importance is not highlighted on the Commission's website so that citizens can easily offer their comments.

This proposal will certainly result in decreasing diversity of viewpoints accessible to the public.

I urge you to reject it.

Thank you.

Linda Beeman
4345 Terra Bella Lane
Clinton, WA 98236

CC: Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

From: Stephen Roberts
To: KM KJMWEB, Kathleen Abernathy, Commissioner Adelstein, Michael Copps, Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 08 AM
Subject: Opposition to further Media Consolidation

Dear Commissioners

I would like to state my opposition to any further rulemaking that permits the further consolidation of media

Corporate media concentration has eroded the local public interest programming that the old rules promoted. It has also placed too much power in the hands of fewer and fewer people.

I read an interesting and convincing article on the print media demonstrating that all 175 organs of the Murdoch organization sang with the same voice on the matter of the war with Iraq. I found through the Internet that the only real voices of dissent on the issue were overseas. With deference to Chairman Powell's sensibilities, this monolithic message is not healthy. The issue next time might be something he finds objectionable.

I put myself through several college years DJ-ing at a local radio station. Local competition produced several niches that, combined, met the needs of most of the community. Coincidentally, my elder son followed this same path and what a difference! All six outlets in Medford, Oregon are owned by the same company. I can see the efficiencies as he does voicework for all of them and several other corporate outlets but much of the programming is not local. The stations have changed hands at least four times in his tenure so there has been little consideration for the local community good. There has been a homogenization. If the only purpose for a station is to provide a little different kind of music-radio is dead as a community resource.

I was really taken aback when the "equal time" concept on political matters was discarded some years ago. It was alleged to be irrelevant. I still disagree. The stifling of minority viewpoints and the disenfranchisement of groups/individuals clearly leads to alienation and even terror.

I strongly urge you to consider the public good along with the economic good in allocating the valuable public airspace. Perhaps a matrix combining required local ownership, and a percentage allocation of other ownerships would be a workable compromise. I really would prefer a "rollback" but I fear that is probably no longer possible. Please don't compound the problems you have already created.

Thank you for your consideration of my viewpoint.

Sincerely,

Stephen Roberts

From: marvin sosna
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1 11 AM
Subject: Deregulation

Sir As a journalist and editor of a prize-winning daily newspaper, I urge you to delay a decision on the proposed changes in media ownership and to sponsor hearings in which the proposed changes are explained and the public is given a voice I am joined in this message by 342 individuals

Marvin Sosna

From: Ladymcb54@aol.com
To: Mike Powell
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:16 AM
Subject: ??? June 2003 vote

What do I look up on your site to get information on the vote that can change the ownership of the air waves so we lose our access to public info, our democracy and freedom of information etc
The vote comes in June and I'm against it but want to know the jargon to fight it
Thanks,
Ingrid

From: Soupson52@aol.com
To: Kathleen Abernathy
Date: Sat, May 3, 2003 1:25 AM
Subject: Fwd giving up our airwaves

In a message dated 5/2/2003 10:08:43 PM Pacific Daylight Time, Soupson52 writes

Dear Sir,

I am horrified at the idea that you would vote to put our airwaves in the hands of only a few. I believe it would be detrimental to the freedom we profess to love. I base my opinion on my recent experience of watching the war with Iraq as it unfolded on the various channels. The experiences on CNN and FOX were so different, one telling the experience as their reporters tried to view it with an open mind and the other limiting its vision according to what I can only guess was the vision of its management. I am humbled at the possibility of getting my news through the eyes of FOX. What a sad day for freedom when we choose to do no better than the Al Jazeera network we profess to scorn for its onesided offerings.

Please stop the madness and summon every ounce of your integrity and goodwill when you vote.

Thank you for your time.

Carolyn Ackmann
email address: soupson52@aol.com

630 Ivywood Lane #D
Simi Valley, CA 93065

CC: Michael Copps, kimweb@fcc.gov, Commissioner Adelstein